DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 098 HE 011 439

AUTHOR Linney, Thomas J.; Ross, Kathleen
TITLE Institutional Impacts of Federal Student Aid Programs: Current Issues and Future Policy Options. AIR Forum 1979 Paper.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (19th, San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Educational Finance; Equal Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Regulation; Financial Policy; Financial Support; Higher Education; Loan Repayment; Need Analysis (Student Financial Aid); Program Administration; *Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum 1979; Basic Educational Opportunity Grants; Education Amendments 1972; Higher Education Act 1965; Supplemental Educational Grants

ABSTRACT

The impact of federal student aid programs on higher education and policy implications are discussed. Historical information on federal aid is presented. Large amounts of federal support are devoted to student assistance funding, which is channeled into the institutions in the form of tuition or housing costs. The student aid programs are designed to promote equal opportunity for attendance at postsecondary institutions. Beyond the large size of federal aid channeled through students, additional impact is created by the method in which this money is allocated to students and institutions. The result of the policies and regulation for the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program is that assistance is larger for low-income students and for those who attend higher-cost institutions. The ways in which these policies affect low-income, middle-income, and high-income students' college choices are discussed. Another issue is the effect of loan programs on colleges and universities. Institutions are required to determine student financial need, keep records, and take necessary steps to insure payment and/or collection on the loan. The government has issued tighter regulations on recordkeeping and the default percentage at an institution. Federal funding of student aid programs has also affected the administration of institutions. Future policy options are considered. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED174098

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

This paper was presented at the Nineteenth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Town and Country Inn in San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of Forum papers.

Mary Corcoran
University of Minnesota
(Editor, AIR Forum Publications)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NE011 439

# Institutional Impacts of Federal Student Aid Programs: Current Issues and Future Policy Options

Thomas J. Linney
Research Associate
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-296-2597

Kathleen Ross
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fort Wright College
West 4000 Randolph Road
Spokane, Washington 92204

Paper Prepared for the Association for Institutional Research
Nineteenth Annual Forum, Issues for the Eighties, May 13-17, 1979
San Diego, California

Abstract

This paper seeks to provide campus based researchers with both an institutional and federal policy perspective on current federal student aid programs. It provides an analysis of the growth of federal appropriations in the area of student aid and of the impacts at the institutional level of the major federal programs of aid to postsecondary education. This analysis demonstrates the significant impact of recently expanded levels of federal student aid programs on institutions and the importance of future policy choices to be made in 1979 as existing federal programs face legislative reauthorization.

Institutional Impacts of Federal Student Aid Programs:
Current Issues and Future Policy Options

This paper seeks to provide campus based researchers with both an institutional and federal policy perspective on current federal student aid programs and the impact they have on instituitons.

The head-on collision in Washington between proponents of tax credits and advocates of expanded existing financial aid programs in 1978 focused national attention on higher education to a degree uncommon in recent years. Though tax credit legislation was defeated in the waning moments of the 95th Congress, version of such a program passed both houses of Congress in 1978.

The Carter Administration was successful in securing an increase of nearly 40 percent in funding for existing student aid programs and expanding them to include aid to middle-income families. Thus, financial relief for middle-income families hard hit by rapidly rising college costs--a matter of growing concern over the past decade--now appears to have advanced to a position on the national agenda that is perhaps higher than at any time in history (Linney 1979). It is also clear that 1979 will see a renewal of this debate as the Congress considers legislative reauthorization of the existing student aid legislation.

With federal expenditures for student aid programs approaching 5 billion dollars in the current (1979) fiscal year an understanding of the size and type of federal expenditures and the public policy considerations that generate federal policy toward such programs is imperative for the postsecondary education community. Colleges and universities in the United States are already dependent upon the federal government for upwards of 30 percent of their operating budgets each year; further budget increases can only increase that dependence. This paper is designed to provide a brief background look at the history and development of federal policies toward higher education, a look at how current policy impacts

on institutions at the campus level, and some sense of the policy options available now and in the future from which federal and institutional policies will be drawn.

The Ninety-Sixth Congress has before it the task of reauthorization of the existing federal programs in the student aid area. While few major changes have been proposed, significant questions of size, type and overall administration and management of student aid programs will be addressed in this reauthorization process. Higher education will have the additional task throughout the next decade of seeking to continue the high levels of support that have been achieved during the sixties and seventies. In an era of uncertain economic growth, changing political climates and changing attitudes toward the federal government in general, this will not be easy. Continued and expanded awareness of the impact and effect of federal student aid programs at the institutional level will be an important part of this process.

Historic Policy Initiatives and Increasing Federal Involvement

Beginning with the national response to World War II, federal involvement with higher education grew swiftly and continuously moving from the funding of research to the provision of benefits for veterans, the support of national manpower needs, funds for institutional expansion, teacher training and finally direct federal student assistance through loan and grant programs designed to provide equal access to postsecondary education for all.

These federal involvements came from a variety of sources, some pushed by the Congress, others supported by Presidential iniative. Eventually, as the various federal programs were reauthorized periodically they came to be considered together in a series of omnibus bills. In 1972, Congress passed and President Nixon approved the Education Amendments of 1972. This culminated nearly four years of legislative debate over the future directions of federal policy with respect to higher education. This difuse legislative package included the extension and

expansion of several existing programs, along with the establishment of a major new program of federal aid to students (Gladieux and Wolanin 1976). It remains as the decade draws to a close, the single most important legislative piece and the keystone of existing federal policy toward higher education. It is this legislation that is currently before the Congress for reauthorization and will, as it is reauthorized and perhaps modified, determine the continuing direction of federal policy toward higher education. Let us examine the current legislation in some detail.

The provisions of the 1972 Education Amendments extended and expanded several existing federal programs of student aid, and established one very significant new federal program--the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG)--and several smaller programs. The BEOG program was intended as a foundation for all subsequent federal student aid programs. As originally envisioned, the BEOG would provide every student with at least $1,400 through a combination of family resources and federal aid. The grant could not exceed more than 50 percent of the cost of attendance at a particular institution but could be supplemented by funds from other federal programs of grants or loans, and/or by state or institutional programs.

Along with the BEOG program, the 1972 Amendments reauthorized the Educational Opportunity Program from the 1965 Higher Education Act; it was renamed the Supplemental Educational Grant Program and was intended to make additional funds available to students from poor families. The 1972 Amendments also continued the College Work-Study Program, providing matching funds for the employment of needy students on campuses. The National Direct Student Loan Program was continued, as was the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, renamed the Federally Insured Student Loan Program. Additionally the Student Loan Marketing Corporation was established (popularly know as Sally-Mae) to expand the availability of FISL program loans at lending institutions by providing a secondary market for student loans supported by the government. Finally the amendments created the State Student Incentive

Grant program, designed to provide matching funds to states that provide scholarship programs for students, thereby increasing at still another level opportunities for student financial aid.

In 1976 the Congress passed the 1976 Higher Education Amendments and they were signed by President Ford. These provisions extended and revised the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the Education Amendments of 1972. Except for technical amendments, no further major initiatives were undertaken by these amendments. In 1978 the Congress passed the Middle Income Student Assistance Act. This expanded the reach of the BEOG program to income levels of up to $25,000 annually. In addition, the legislation removed income ceilings on eligibility for FISL student loan programs as an additional aid to families faced with college costs. All of these amended programs are now subject to reauthorization. Major changes in the grant programs are not expected. High interest costs, and high default rates in the student loan programs suggest the need for major changes in loan program organization, However, the major alternatives have yet to emerge from either the Carter administration or the Congress.

The 1972 Education Amendments that contain the major federal student aid policy iniatives have had a rather checkered legislative history. In a continuing struggle between the Congress and the Nixon and Ford administrations, funding for many of the provisions was not requested, or it was appropriated at reduced levels that mitigated to some extent the intended effects of the student aid provisions.It is only in fiscal 1978 that most of the programs have had appropriations somewhere near their intended level. And it is only with the Carter administration requests for fiscal 1979 that they have been proposed for extensive expansion. Thus it is only in the last two years that increased appropriation for the 1972 Education Amendments has demonstrated their significance and impact on institutions as major federal policy initiatives. These impacts on institutions seem destined to grow. The authors believe that institutions have

a major interest in the future direction of federal policy options and need to increase their awareness of both the effect of federal student aid programs on institutions and of the policy debate that exists in the Congress concerning the future direction of federal policies toward student aid.

Institutional Impacts of Current Policies

The involvement of the federal government has come to have a significant impact on higher education in the United States. As the 1980's begin, student aid programs designed to promote equal opportunity for attendance at postsecondary institutions continued to enjoy public and congressional support. This nation continues to support an educational policy committed to pursuing equity in the oppportunity for personal advancement.

Let us now examine the significance of the federal government's high level of support for higher education at the institutional level, and the implications of that policy for the entire system of higher education.

Although the aggregate figures of federal dollar supportsound impressive, they also have a remoteness at the campus level. Most academic personnel are aware of federal appporpriations in support of research and specialized training programs; but there is a tendency among those not directly connected with securing federal funds to consider these programs only superficially connected with the entire institutional enterprise. Those more directly connected with federal programs of institutional support certainly understand that the seemingly insular funding of particular programs does in fact reach beyond program enclaves by reason of the portion in each program grant that is allotted to administrative overhead and institutional indirect costs. Those funds help to support increased administrative staffing necessary for recordkeeping and institutional compliance with myriad federal regulations.

Leaving aside specialized programs, does the increased level of federal support of the last decade really have an impact on the campus? There is a startling contrast between the remoteness of program and research funds and the massive amounts of federal dollars devoted to student assistance funding. Federal support in this area is indirect, for student assistance dollars are channeled through students who receive funds from the federal government in the form of grants and loans and then return it to the institutions in the form of tuition or housing costs. The level of this funding is unprecedented. Consider the following facts:

1. In fiscal year 1978 the U.S. Office of Education has spent 3.7 billion on studentassistance programs. These programs include: Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOG), Suplemental Education Opportunity Grans (SEOG), College Work-Study (CWS) Grants, National Direct Student Loans (NDSL), Federally Insured Student Loans (FISL), and State Student Incentive Grants (SSIG) (see Table 1).

2. In addition, the Veteran's Adminstration reports expenditures of 2.7 billion dollars in fiscal 1978 for postsecondary education costs of veterans; the Social Security Administration likewise reported $1.3 billion for Social Security education benefits in fiscal 1978. (See Table 2)

3. Thus, a total of $7.7 billion for fiscal 1978 in federal funds is being channeled directly to college students for their education expenses. An estimated one-third to one-half of this amount is spent by students on tuition and fees (depending on how expensive the individual institution's tuition and fees are); the balance goes to living expenses.

4. If total income from tuition and fees for all colleges and universities in fiscal 1978 can be projected to be $9.1 billion (Brandt 1979), it can be estimated that the federal government is the indirect source of at least one quarter and perhaps as much as 40% of the tuition and fee income at any given college or university! For private institutions this is an especially significant finding, since close to 40% of their total revenues, on the average,

are from tuition and fees. For public institutions, tuition and fees average about 15 percent of total revenues (Didham, Hull, Newman and Eisner 1976).

Reducing the overall figures to a per student number gives these facts a startling clarity. It the student aid expenditures from the Office of Education the Veteran's Educational Benefits Program, and the Social Security Education Benefits programs are combined, then adjusted by subtracting the amount of funds that go to proprietary and non-postsecondary training, and reduced again for the percentage of the funds that go to students' personal living expenses, we can estimate a per student amount from the full-time-equivalent enrollment tables.[1]

For fiscal year 1978, this estimate for per student federal aid for tuition and fees is $920 per student in private institution and $335 per student in public institutions. In addition, the remainder of student aid funds--i.e., funds allocated for living expenses--awarded to students in colleges and universities, when averaged of a full-time-equivalent enrollment of approximately 8,800,000 students in fiscal year 1978, gives an additional federal student aid award of $400 per student. For those who use college-run facilities for room and/or board, all of this $400 award returns to the college through charges for living quarters and/or meals. For non-residential students, this money would not enter the collegiate coffers.

To summarize these per student figures: the average amount per full-time-equivalent student that a private college or university received in 1978 was a minimum of $920 (non-residential students ) and a maximum of $1320 (residential) from federal student aid funds via tuition/room/board fees from the student. The average amount per full-time-equivalent student that a public college or university received ranged from $335 (nonresidential) to $735 (residential) in federal student aid funds.

These figures demonstrate dramatically that the federal government's student aid programs channel huge sums to colleges and universities at the campus level. As a point of contrast, consider the amount of money derived from donors,

private gifts and other benefactors. In fiscal year 1975, this amounted to $1.7 billion (Grand and Lind 1977); tuition and fees that year amounted to $7.2 billion. Applying that same ratio to fiscal year 1978 we obtain an estimated figure of only $2.3 billion dollars in gifts from private donors during fiscal 1978. It is clear that federal support through student aid funds contributes significantly more to colleges and universities than does the total given to colleges and universities by the entire philanthropic community of the United States. Few institutions budgets today could withstand the evaporation of federal aid to students without drastic cuts in current programs!

Campus Implications of Federal Policies

Beyond the sheer size of the federal appropriations channeled through student aid, additional impact is created by the method in which this money is allocated to students and institutions. The allocation policy, which emerged as a compromise between a number of alternatives proposed during the adoption of the legislation and subsequent implementation regulations promulgated by the Office of Education, further modified by the Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1978, has a significant effect on the socio-economic class from which aid recipients, and therefore enrollees, come. There are also regulations that concern the application of federal funds to various student costs. The result of these policies and regulations is that BEOG program grants are larger for low income students and for those who are attending higher cost institutions.

How does the current policy of providing student aid affect individual institutions? Although as yet no hard data exist to trace the effects empirically, it is easy to surmise that students who might enroll at any given institution might be affected in several ways.

First, the probable distribution of students by socio-economic class bears examining. Students from families with incomes below the poverty line should be able to attend moderately-priced institutions much more easily than before. However, students from the most impoverished homes will be unable to attend any but the

least expensive institutions. Students from middle income families without benefit of special circumstances entitling them to deductions may well be ineligible for any grant aid and may thus be obligated to attend a less expensive institution. Hyde (1975) puts it this way:

> A needy student who chooses to attend a low or no tuition school can have all his direct costs covered by the BEOG program, but if the same person decides to attend another school that charges several thousand dollars for tuition, the student's full BEOG would cover less than half his costs. For some students the net effect is access to particular schools, but access with limited choice is only partial access.

The numerous institutions that traditionally have drawn their student body in large measure either from the middle class whose income is just slightly over the cut-off point, or from poorer families who, given current policies, can afford to attend only low-cost schools, may be forced to invest a larger proportion of institutional funds in student grants in order to serve their traditional clientele.

Students from upper income families are not eligible for BEOG funds; these funds fail to serve as any kind of incentive for post-secondary attendance of upper income students. Since lower income students have been and will be receiving an additional incentive, the proportion of upper income students might well decline in proportion to the lower income students. Accordingly, the percentages attending postsecondary education from the two groups likely will converge and may even off. In 1972, approximately 86 percent of those with high ability from the upper income groups attended postsecondary institutions while only 64 percent of those with high ability from the lower income groups did. But there is some evidence that a leveling off is beginning to occur. Between 1970 and 1975, the attendance rate among high income families (over $20,000) fell by 3.9 percent while the attendance rate among low income families increased by 13.6 percent (Congressional Budget Office 1977). The composition of institution student bodies may well be changing as a function of federal student aid policies.

Another factor in the current federal aid policies that may affect the

composition of institutional attendance is the loan program. The federal government provides loans to students through the National Direct Student Loan (NDSL)program and the Federally Insured Student Loan (FISL) program. Interest charges on these loans are deferred until the student completes his education. The effects of these loan programs on colleges and universities are complex.

First, students with NDSL loans stand in a different relationship with their college or university that is required to determine the student's financial need, maintain files on addresses and payment records, and take necessary steps to insure payment and/or collection on the NDSL loan. Consequently, the institution becomes not only the student's mentor, but also his creditor.

Second, in the late 1970's Office of Education officials, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and congressional leaders have placed increased emphasis on what appearsto be a large increase in the default rate on all types of federal loan programs. The 1976 Higher Education Amendments contained a provision designed to prohibit the discharge of student loan repayment obligations through bankruptcy for a period of five years after the student has completed his course of study. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has issued tighter regulations on recordkeeping and tied the annual funding of institutional requests for NDSL funds to the default percentage at any given institution. Subsequently, institutions have been increasingly pressured by regulations to maintain more extensive and accurate records and to maintain or contract for collection services at the institutional level.

Thirdly, federal funding of student aid programs has affected the administration of institutions. This has been discussed at length in sveral studies (Van Alstyne and Coldren 1976, Shulman 1978, Finn 1978, Saunders 1976) the thrust of which concern the increased costs of administration brought about the federal regulatory requirements.

Current Issues and Future Policy Options

As can be seen from the previous discussions, federal student aid programs as presently constituted have substantial institutional impact. Continuation, expansion or contraction of these programs is a matter of vital interest throughout the enterprise of higher education. Current public policy as expressed by the multitude of federal and related state legislation in the area of student aid continues to support higher education and more specifically, the opportunity for access to higher education for all citizens with the ability to benefit from such education. For the current congress and the Carter administration, the process leading to reauthorization of the existing legislation is one without unusual probelms of drastic alterations in existing programs.

With respect to the variety of existing programs, the BEOG program continues to have difficulty with the new and tighter standards imposed through computer checking of data submitted by applicants to prevent fraud, abuse and error. The Office Education, Bureau of Student Financial Assistance, continues to develop a single and more simple form that would eliminate some of the errors caused by the complexity of existing applications procedures. The various campus based student aid official continue to oppose over-simplification of application procedures, and possible link-ups between the applicants'federal income tax forms and an eligibility determination, because they suggest this will cause institutions to require additional information to complete the delivery of student aid packages that often include state and institutional aid. This debate will probably continue for some time. The effect of the tightened regulations has been to slow the expansion of this program, and thus to require slightly reduced levels of federal appropriations for the BEOG program. Other issues affecting the BEOG program include continued debate over present half cost limitations, existing forms of needs assessment and continued pressure for the expanded inclusion of independent and part time students under the terms of this program. Future issues that concern this program will most likely include continued debate over the size of

program and whether in an era of declining enrollments in higher education this program ought to continue to expand for reasons of continued inflation and continued expansion in the clientele served by institutions of higher education. Issues in this future debate may include the notion that student aid programs be elevated to the level of federal entitlements (as social security and federal health programs are in present budgets) to insulate student assistnace from annual debates over the level of appropriations for these programs (Califano 1979, Luggiero 1979, U.S. Congress 1979).

SEOG and CWS programs enjoy continued support and are unlikely to face and major changes. The Carter administration has proposed that the funding levels of these programs be disconnected from the exsisting trigger mechanisms, that currently provide that funding for these programs be maintained at specified levels before funds can be appropriated for BEOG programs. (The NDSL program has a similar funding trigger.) This would aid budget flexibility and enable appropriations to be considered for the major student aid progams on a separate basis. The Congress imposed such trigger mechanisms in existing laws, to prevent piecemeal dismantling of the federal student aid policies. It is unclear if such fears are still justified.

NDSL and GSL loan programs will undergo the most serious re-examination during reauthorization in the ninety-sixth Congress. HIgh interest rates, continued problems with defaults, inflationary effects, and other issues of proper use and appropriate design will mean a complete review and possible restructuring of the combined federal loan programs. High interest rates and continued inflation together will impart a certain urgency to he restructuring of these programs. Student loan costs are significantly below all other interest rates on borrowed funds. IN the NDSL program, continued high default rates coupled with inflation make expansion of this campus based program difficult to justify. A restructured federal program, with slight increases in the interest rate, and federal responsiblity for collection would solve many existing problems

while continuing to make available low cost federal loans with eligibility based on need. In the GSL program some consolidation of the current programs, that currently include Federal Insured Student Loans, Health Education Assistance Loans, Health Public Service Loans and Nursing Student Loans, should be expected. The larger issue with loan progrmas in general is this: should the federal goverment continue to pay interest subsidies to commerical banking institutions to encourage the availability of student loans and in the process make the true cost of these loans at or just below the prime interest rate, or should the federal government make these loans directly to students from federal appropriations (Califano, 1979). Federal proposals in this area have not yet been released. These issues may not be resolved in this current reauthorization period, however, they will continue to effect students and their institutions throughout the decade ahead.

Conclusion

By this time it should be evident that federal funding of higher education is a policy issue replete with complexities, not unlike those "deus ex machina" contraptions for the Elizabethan stage: a maze of rigs, pulleys, cogged wheel, drive shafts, and sliding bolts in which a single rope offstage is pulled, engaging myriad moving parts and the eye is baffled in following the intricate movement. In shaping federal funding policy for higher education, imagination and creativity are needed to hypothesize exactly where movement in the system will result from a given decision. Imagination and creativity applied to complex problems has always been the contribution of higher education.

The federal role in the development an support of higher education is now clearly understood. Equally available, in terms of a knowledge base and literature but perhaps not so well understood, is the public policy process with respect to higher education, and the ability and willingness of higher education to engage in the political and educational process at the seat of government to assure continued

attention, appropriations and actions that are mutually supportive between the higher education community and the federal government. Institutions and institutional researchers have a significent role to play in this process, for the effect of fereral programs on institutions is an important voice that must necessarly be heard in the policy making process. Research that discusses the impact of federal programs at the campus level is increasingly important for the development of public policy in two major ways. First, campuses and the students and faculty who populate them are voters, and as such have a direct impact on developing federal legislation. Studies that demonstrate campus and therefore voter impact of federal programs, can carry great weight as policies are formulated. Second, federal programs that effect higher education at the campus level, are often not well understood by those most effected. Research that demonstrates these effects, especially in the area of student aid programs, and that is disseminated throughout the campus student and faculty communities can secure greater understanding of existing federal policies, and provide appropriate factual basis for changing those policies when that is appropriate. Finally, it was not the intention of this paper to demonstrate the growing dependence of higher education on the federal government. A careful reading cannot help but disclose this trend. While the federal government is in many cases the most appropriate funding source for programs that seek to guarantee equity and the equality of access to higher education, centralized funding of higher education in this country has never been a national goal. Diversity and plurality characterize the strength of American higher education. Such strength and diversity must continue to include diverse sources of support. These include the continued support from state, local and private sources. Encouragement of such continued diversity and plurality remains very much in the national interest, as well as in the interest of every local campus and institution in the nation.

Table One

Federal student Aid Appropriations, Office of Education
By Fiscal Year, Actual Amounts
In Millions of Dollars

| Program/Fiscal Year | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979*[1] | 1980# |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BEOG | -- | 122,000 | 475,000 | 660,000 | 1,325,800 | 1,692,200 | 2,140,000 | 2,600,000 | 2,444,000 |
| SEOG | 220,300 | 210,876 | 210,300 | 240,300 | 240,093 | 250,093 | 270,093 | 340,100 | 340,100 |
| College Work-Study | 426,600 | 274,498 | 270,200 | 420,000 | 390,000 | 390,000 | 435,000 | 550,000 | 550,000 |
| NDSL Program | 316,584 | 568,195 | 286,000 | 321,000 | 331,690 | 323,220 | 325,660 | 328,900 | 234,800 |
| SSIG Program | -- | -- | 19,000 | 20,000 | 44,000 | 60,000 | 63,000 | 76,750 | 76,750 |
| Guananteed Loan Programs: Interest | 196,600 | 245,000 | 310,000 | 382,400 | 452,000 | 334,354 | 280,141 | 517,206 | 793,624 |
| Guaranteed Loans in Default (FISL) | 12,765 | 46,640 | 88,668 | 197,600 | 201,787 | 32,312 | 199,522 | 184,635 | 165,997 |
| Totals/ | 1,172,849 | 1,467,009 | 1,659,168 | 2,241,300 | 2,985,640 | 3,082,179 | 3,714,166 | 4,840,780 | 4,605,271 |
| % yearly increase | -- | 25% | 13% | 35% | 33% | 3% | 20% | 30% | (5)% |

* Estimated
\# Requested
1. Includes supplemental requested
2. Includes $726,000,000 reappropriated from previous years

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education
1/29/79, 1/30/78, 1/24/77, 1/26/76
2/10/75, 2/11/74, 2/5/73 Summaries of the United States Budget

Table Two

Federal Student Aid Appropriations
Social Security Administration and Veterans Administration
By Fiscal Year, Actual Amounts
In Millions of Dollars

| Program/Fiscal Year | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979* | 1980# |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Social Security Administration Student Grants: Higher Education | 840,000 | 967,000 | 1,181,000 | 1,277,000 | 1,378,000 | 1,509,000 |
| Veterans Administration: Veterans Education Benefits | 3,479,000 | 3,806,000 | 2,820,000 | 2,697,000 | 2,214,000 | 1,892,000 |
| Total SSA and VA Programs | 4,319,000 | 4,773,000 | 4,001,000 | 3,974,000 | 3,592,000 | 3,401,000 |

*Estimated
#Requested

Source: The Budget of the United States Government
Fiscal Years 1980, 1979,1978, 1977, 1976
Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office 1975 thru 1979.

## Notes

[1] These adjustments are based on percentages of funding going to non-profit postsecondary educational institutions. (Congressional Budget Office, 1977, p.37; College Board, 1978, p.7) Estimates for the amounts of funding spent by students on living expenses are based on average prices of tuition at private and public institutions; (Grant and Lind, 1977,1978) percentages of funds awarded to private and public institutions; (Congressional Budget Office, 1977) and estimated per student awards in the various Office of Education programs (College Board, 1978).

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Babbidge, Home D., Jr., and Rosenzweig, Robert M. The Federal Interest in Higher Education.

Brandt, Norman J. Financial Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1978: Preliminary Tabulations. Washington, D.C. National Center for Education Statistics. February 1979.

Califano, Joseph A. Jr. Testimony of Secretary Califano Before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D.C. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfar, March 20, 1979.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

The College Board. The Fiscal Year 1979 Federal Budget and the Outlook for Student Assistance Programs. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

Congressional Budget Office. Post-Secondary Education: The Current Federal Role and Alternative Approaches. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Stock No. 052-070-03908-6, 1977.

Finn, Chester E. Scholars, Dollars and Bureaucrats. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.

"Funds for Higher Education in HEW's 1980 Budget." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XVII, No. 20, January 29, 1979, p.3.

Didham, James R., Hull, Alan L., Newman, George C., Eisner, Ronald E. Limited Growth in Higher Education: Indicators, Impacts and Implications. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1976.

Gladieux, Lawrence E., and Wolanin, Thomas R. Congress and the Colleges. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1976.

Grant, W. Vance, and Lind C. George. Digest of Education Statistics, 1976 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977.

_____. Digest of Education Statistics 1977-78 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978.

"Higher Education's Share of U.S. Budgets: Fact File," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 19, February 11, 1974, p. 6.

"Higher Education's Share of U.S. Budget: 1975," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 19, February 11, 1974, p. 4.

Hyde, William D., Jr. "Student Financial Aid for Higher Education," Proceedings of the National Academy of Education, Vol. 2, 1975. n.p.n.: THe National Academy of Education, 1975.

Linney, Thomas J. "Changing Values in Higher Education." AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, April 1978.

Linney, Thomas and Ross, Kathleen. Federal Student Aid Programs. A Briefing Paper on Impacts and Policy Options. Claremont, CA: Clarmeont Institute of Administrative Studies, 1978. HE 010 923 (May 1979, RIE)

National Center for Education Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1977. Vol. 3, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Stock No. 017-080-01678-8, 1977.

Rivlin, Alice. The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1961.

Roark, Anne C. "Fact File: U.S. Higher Education Budget," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol XV, No. 2o0, January 30, 1978, p.8.

Saunders, Charles B., Jr. "Easing the Burden of Federal Regulations: The Next Move Is Ours," Educational Record 57 (Fall 1976): 217-224.

Shulman, Carol Herrnstadt. Compliance with Federal Regulations: At What Cost? ERIC Research Resport No. 6. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

"U.S. Budget for 1974: Higher Education's Share," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VII, No. 18, February 5, 1973, p. 1.

U.S. Congress. A Compilation of Federal Education Laws as Amended through December 31, 1974. 94th Congress, 1st Session, Joint Committee Print. Washington, D.D.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Congress. Legislative Recommendations for Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and Related Measures. Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

Van Alstyne, Carol, and Coldren, Sharon L. The Costs of Supplementary Federally Mandated Social Programs at Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1976.

"What Congress Voted for Higher Education in 1972," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VII, No. 4, October 30, 1972, p.2.

Winkler, Karen J. "Fact File: Budget for Higher Education," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XIII, No. 19, January 24, 1977, p.8.

_____. "Fact File: Higher Education's Share of U.S. Budgets," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XI, No. 18, January 26, 1976, p. 4.